

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-58 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 28, and 37 are independent claims. Claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph. Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1 and 28 have been objected to based on a lack of the use of the word “and” for separating claim limitations. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 28 have been amended to address the informality. Removal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-13 and 15-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Regarding base Claims 1, 28, and 37, the examiner states that the term “embedding document contents” is not found in the Applicants’ Specification. However, literal support for the concept of “embedding document contents” is found on page 6, lines 17-19, of the Applicants’ Specification as originally filed. Therefore, Claims 1, 28, and 37 comply with the written description requirement.

Dependent Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-36, and 38-58 were rejected based on the rejections of base Claims 1, 28, and 37, thus, Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-36, and 38-58 also comply with the written description requirement.

As such, the 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, rejections of Claims 1-13 and 15-58 are believed to be overcome. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-13 and 15-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding base Claims 1, 28, and 37, the examiner states that the limitation of “which said documents may or may not exist” is not positively recited, and suggests amending the limitation to recite “which said documents will or will not exist.” Accordingly, base Claims 1, 28, and 37 have been amended in the manner suggested by the examiner.

Further, the examiner states that the limitation of “new documents expected to be added to said workfolder” is not positively recited, and suggests amending the limitation to recite “new documents to be added to said workfolder.” Accordingly, base Claims 1, 28, and 37 have been amended in the manner suggested by the examiner.

Further, the examiner states that the inclusion of a “wherein” clause in base Claims 1, 28, and 37 renders the claims indefinite. The clause has been amended such that it is no longer a clause of intended use and, thus, does not render the claims indefinite. Therefore, base Claims 1, 28, and 37 should be found in allowable condition.

Further, the examiner states that where Claims 1, 28, and 37 fail to interrelate elements, the claims fail to point out and distinctly claim Applicants’ invention as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph. The foregoing amendments to base Claims 1, 28, and 37 further provide interrelations among the recited elements. Support for these amendments is found in the Applicants’ Specification on at least page 6, lines 3-5 and 17-19 as originally filed. No new matter is introduced.

Dependent Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-36, and 38-58 were rejected based on the rejections of base Claims 1, 28, and 37, thus, Claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-36, and 38-58 should also be found in allowable condition.

As such, the 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, rejections of Claims 1-13 and 15-58 are believed to be overcome. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


Accordingly, the present invention as claimed is believed to comply with the written description requirement and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, and acceptance of Claims 1-13 and 15-58 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-13 and 15-58) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 5/31/07